

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 7/27/2009.
2. Claims 1-43 are pending in this application with claims 1, 18, 32, 33, 34, and 35 amended.

Response to Amendment

3. The rejection to claims 32 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 18-31, 34, 35, and 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,706,510 to Burgoon, in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,966,058 to Earl et al. ("Earl"), in further view of U.S. Patent No 7,505,971 to Sander et al. ("Sander")

As per claims 18, 34, and 35, Burgoon teaches:

creating a first version of a shared file (see at least FIGS. 2-3 "**construct a shared file system comprising a plurality of file versions**" – this includes first version, second version, third version, etc.);

creating a second version of a shared file (see at least FIGS. 2-3 "**construct a shared file system comprising a plurality of file versions**" – this includes first version, second version, third version, etc.);

creating a first private symbolic link to reference the first version of the shared file (see at least col. 4:25-27 "**...wherein each of the created files 436-442 is a symbolic link corresponding to a file version 302-308 in the shared file system 104**"), *the first private symbolic link comprising link criteria that designates that members in a first group are authorized to use the first private symbolic link* (see also at least FIGS. 2-4 "**create a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user file systems**" – Note: The symbolic links are created for member user only);

creating a second private symbolic link to reference the second version of the shared file (see at least col. 4:25-27 "**...wherein each of the created files 436-442 is a symbolic link corresponding to a file version 302-308 in the shared file system 104**"), *the second private symbolic link only applying to the members of the second group associated with the second private symbolic link*, (see at least FIGS. 2-4 "**create**

a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user file systems"); and

storing the first private symbolic link and/or the second private symbolic link in a volatile or non-volatile computer usable medium or displaying the first private symbolic link and/or the second symbolic link on a display device (see at least col. 3:1-3 "A plurality of symbolic links are stored as files in the directory hierarchies comprising any of the plurality of user file systems").

Burgoon does not explicitly teach:

such that the first private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the first private symbolic link is not visible to members of a second group, wherein the member of the second group can not access the first version of the shared file by utilizing the first private symbolic link during a rolling upgrade in a computing system; and

such that the second private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the second symbolic link is not visible to the members of the first group, wherein the members of the first group can not access the second version of the shared file by utilizing the second private symbolic link during the rolling upgrade in the computing system.

Earl teaches

Performing the rolling update in the computing system (see at least col. 2:39-43 **"performing the rolling upgrade process by sequentially loading and rebooting each of the plurality of nodes with the new software release; and ensuring that the plurality of fault-tolerant services remains available throughout the rolling upgrade process"**).

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Burgoon to incorporate the teaching of Earl to use the symbolic links in Burgoon to perform the rolling upgrade. The modification would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art because it would provide the user more free memory spaces.

Neither Burgoon nor Earl teaches

such that the first private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the first private symbolic link is not visible to members of a second group, wherein the member of the second group can not access the first version of the shared file by utilizing the first private symbolic link; and

such that the second private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the second symbolic link is not visible to the members of the first group, wherein the members of the first group can not access the second version of the shared file by utilizing the second private symbolic link during the rolling upgrade in the computing system.

However, Sander teaches

such that the first private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the first private symbolic link is not visible to members of a second group, wherein the member of the second group can not access the first version of the shared file by utilizing the first private symbolic link (see at least col. 2:52-61 "**An account manager 49 prevents each user of shared drive 19 from seeing directory structures for other users...Link update routine 47 creates and maintains symbolic links within each directory structure to files for which the corresponding user has editable access...**"; see also col. 3:1-7 "**As can be seen from FIG. 1, the user corresponding to directory structure 40 has editable access to file 43 and file 44 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 41 has editable access to file 43, file 45 and file 46 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 42 has editable access to file 45 and file 46 within database 17**"); and

such that the second private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the second symbolic link is not visible to the members of the first group, wherein the members of the first group can not access the second version of the shared file by utilizing the second private symbolic link during the rolling upgrade in the computing system (see at least col. 2:52-61 "**An account manager 49 prevents each user of shared drive 19 from seeing directory structures for other users...Link update routine 47 creates and maintains symbolic links within each directory**

structure to files for which the corresponding user has editable access..."; see also col. 3:1-7 "As can be seen from FIG. 1, the user corresponding to directory structure 40 has editable access to file 43 and file 44 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 41 has editable access to file 43, file 45 and file 46 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 42 has editable access to file 45 and file 46 within database 17").

Therefore, it would be obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Burgoon in combination with Earl to incorporate the teaching of Sander to create private symbolic links for each user or a group of members to access files within a database. The modification would have been obvious because it would provide a protection against the shared files.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first and second versions of the shared file are web pages (see at least **FIGS. 3).**

As per claims 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

members of a first group are entities operating a first browser application and members of the second group are entities operating a second browser application (**the user file systems are logically separated. Therefore, they operate different browser application).**

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first symbolic link has a link criteria that defines the membership of the members of the first group associated with the first symbolic link (see at least FIG. 4 "USER1/PROJECT/...USER_A3").

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the link criteria identifies a member to create a member private symbolic link (see at least col. 23:18-19 "...local_dir is a privately owned directory 344 in a user's file system").

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the link criteria identifies an application version number (see at least FIG. 4 ".../USER_A3 – FILE_A3).

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first group comprises multiple entities as members (see at least FIG. 1 "USER1, USER2...).

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first symbolic link provides a reference for a specific pathname (see at least FIG. 4).

As per claim 26, the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first symbolic link provides a reference for a directory (see at last FIG. 4).

As per claims 27, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first private symbolic references a first private copy of the first version of the shared file and the second private symbolic link references a second private copy of the second version of the shared file (see at least col. 5:10-11 "the correspondence of symbolic links 436-442 and file versions 302-308 being based on a map entry 352").

As per claim 28, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

wherein both the members of the first group and members of the group simultaneously operate different versions of the one or more shared files (see at least FIG. 4 – "FILE_A2, FILE_B2...").

As per claim 29, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

one or more copies exist for each version of the one or more shared files (see at least FIG. 4 – "FILE_A2, FILE_B2...").

As per claim 30, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

creating a direct object reference for the members of the first group to the first version of the shared file (see at least FIG. 2 **"create a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user file systems"**).

As per claim 31, the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the direct object reference is automatically created by removing the first private symbolic link (see at least col. 27:38-39 **"The symbolic link 436 is then replaced with the requested physical file"**).

As per claim 40, the rejection of claim 34 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first and second versions of the shared file are web pages (see at least **FIGS. 3**).

As per claims 41, the rejection of claim 34 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first private symbolic references a first private copy of the first version of the shared file and the second private symbolic link references a second private copy of the second version of the shared file (see at least col. 5:10-11 **"the correspondence of symbolic links 436-442 and file versions 302-308 being based on a map entry 352"**).

As per claim 42, the rejection of claim 35 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first and second versions of the shared file are web pages (see at least **FIGS. 3**).

As per claims 43, the rejection of claim 35 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the first private symbolic references a first private copy of the first version of the shared file and the second private symbolic link references a second private copy of the second version of the shared file (see at least col. 5:10-11 "**the correspondence of symbolic links 436-442 and file versions 302-308 being based on a map entry 352**").

7. Claims 1-13, 15-17, 32, 33, and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent no. 7,130,897 to Dervin et al. ("Dervin"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,510 to Burgoon, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,505,971 to Sander et al. ("Sander").

As per claims 1, 32, and 33, Dervin teaches:

creating a second version of the shared file (see at least col. 9:2-3 "**a new cluster version may be "rolled out" among members of the cluster**");

bringing down a first member, wherein a second member is not brought down while the first member is down (see at least col. 9:2-17 "**In embodiments consistent with the present invention, a new cluster version may be "rolled out" among members of the cluster, one node at a time (e.g., one node is taken down, a new**

cluster version installed, and the node brought back into the cluster). Moreover, by using the existing member management functionality in a clustered computer system, members are automatically removed from and returned to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...It will be further appreciated that although the individual nodes have gone down during this process, the cluster and group in the cluster as a whole have not, thus the availability of the system is maintained throughout");

bringing up the first member so that the first member references the second version of the shared file (col. 9:2-17 "... members are automatically removed (i.e. bringing down) from and returned (i.e. bringing up) to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout..."), wherein the first and second members are upgraded in a staggered manner (members of a node are updated sequentially one at a time)

Dervin does not explicitly teach

using a processor for generating a private symbolic link for the first member to reference the second version of the shared file, the private symbolic link comprising link criteria that designates that the first member of the group is authorized to use the private symbolic link such that the private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the private symbolic link is not visible to the second member

of the group, wherein the first member accesses version of shared file based at least in part upon the private symbolic link during the rolling upgrade in the computing system.

Burgoon teaches an analogous art of:

using a processor to generate a private symbolic link for the first member to reference the second version of the shared file (see at least col. 4:25-27 "...wherein each of the created files 436-442 is a symbolic link corresponding to a file version 302-308 in the shared file system 104"), the private symbolic link comprising link criteria that designates that the first member of the group is authorized to use the private symbolic link (see at last FIGS. 2-3 "create a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user files systems");

storing the private symbolic link in a volatile or non-volatile computer usable medium or displaying the private symbolic link on a display device (see at least col. 3:1-3 "A plurality of symbolic links are stored as files in the directory hierarchies comprising any of the plurality of user file systems")

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dervin to incorporate the teaching of Burgoon to use symbolic links for rolling upgrade. The modification would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art because it would provide the user with more free memory spaces.

Neither Dervin nor Burgoon teaches

such that the private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the private symbolic link is not visible to the second member of the group, wherein the first member accesses version of shared file based at least in part upon the private symbolic link.

However, Sander teaches

such that the private symbolic link does not provide a universally visible symbolic link so that the private symbolic link is not visible to the second member of the group, wherein the first member accesses version of shared file based at least in part upon the private symbolic link (see at least col. 2:52-61 **"An account manager 49 prevents each user of shared drive 19 from seeing directory structures for other users...Link update routine 47 creates and maintains symbolic links within each directory structure to files for which the corresponding user has editable access..."**; see also col. 3:1-7 **"As can be seen from FIG. 1, the user corresponding to directory structure 40 has editable access to file 43 and file 44 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 41 has editable access to file 43, file 45 and file 46 within database 17. The user corresponding to directory structure 42 has editable access to file 45 and file 46 within database 17"**).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Burgoon in combination with Earl to

incorporate the teaching of Sander to create private symbolic links for each user or a group of members to access files within a database. The modification would have been obvious because it would provide a protection against the shared files.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

bringing down the second member, wherein the first member is not brought down while the second member is down (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**"); and

bringing up the second member (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**").

Dervin does not explicitly teach

creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference the second version of the shared file.

However, Burgoon teaches

creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference the second version of the shared file (see Burgoon at least FIGS. 2-3 "**create a plurality of**

symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user files systems”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dervin to incorporate the teaching of Burgoon to use symbolic links for rolling upgrade. The modification would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art because it would provide the user with more free memory spaces.

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the private symbolic link and the second symbolic link are the same, and wherein both the first and second members are members of the group associated with the private symbolic link (see at least FIGS. 1-4).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporate, Dervin teaches:

removing the first version of the shared file (see Dervin at least col. 9:3-5 “...a new cluster version may be “rolled out” among members of the cluster, one node at a time (e.g., one node is taken down, a new cluster version installed – members are taken down for removing the first version).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

*the private symbolic link for the first member references a first private copy of the second version of the shared file and the second private symbolic link for the second member references a second private copy of the second version of the shared file (see at least **FIGS. 1-4**).*

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

*the private symbolic link for the first member and the second private symbolic link for the second member references the same copy of the second version of the shared file (see at least **FIG. 4**).*

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

bringing up the second member so that the second member references the third version of the shared file, wherein both the first member and the second member simultaneously operate different versions in the computing system (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... members are automatically removed (i.e. bringing down) from and returned (i.e. bringing up) to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...").

Dervin does not explicitly teach

bringing down the second member, wherein the first member is not brought down while the second member is down;

creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference a third version of the shared file.

However, Burgoon teaches

bringing down the second member, wherein the first member is not brought down while the second member is down (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... members are automatically removed (i.e. bringing down) from and returned (i.e. bringing up) to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout..."); and

creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference a third version of the shared file (see Burgoon at least FIGS. 2-3 "create a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user files systems").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dervin to incorporate the teaching of Burgoon to use symbolic links for rolling upgrade. The modification would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art because it would provide the user with more free memory spaces.

As per claim 8, the rejection to claim 1 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

one or more copies exist for each version of the computer application (see at least FIG. 4 "FILE_A3, FILE_B2...").

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the private symbolic link comprises a property that identifies a link criteria (see at least FIG. 4 "/USER1/PROJECT/...USER_A3...").

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the link criteria comprises a member identifier (see at least FIG. 4 "/USER1/...").

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

creating a direct object reference for the first member to the second version of the shared file (see at least FIGS. 2-4).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the direct object reference is automatically created by removing the private symbolic link (see at least col. 27:38-39 "The symbolic link 436 is then replaced with the requested physical file").

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

bringing down the second member, wherein the first member is not brought down while the second member is down (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... members are

automatically removed (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**"); and

bringing up the second member (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**").

Dervin does not explicitly teach

creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference the third version of the shared file; and
creating a third version of the shared file.

However, Burgoon teaches

creating a third version of the shared file (see Burgoon at least FIGS. 2-4 **"construct a shared file system comprising a plurality of file versions"**); and
creating a second private symbolic link for the second member to reference the third version of the shared file (see Burgoon at least FIGS. 2-4 **"create a plurality of symbolic links under the directory hierarchies of the plurality of user file systems"**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dervin to incorporate the teaching of Burgoon to use symbolic links for rolling upgrade. The modification would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art because it would provide the user with more free memory spaces.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the private symbolic link is private to a member (see at least col. 23:18-19

"...local_dir is a privately owned directory 344 in a user's file system").

As per claim 16, the rejection to claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

the act of bringing down the first member comprises: shutting down a computer application at a node associated with the first member (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down or shutting down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**").

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

the first member still executes the first version of the computer application concurrently with the second member executing the new version of the computer application (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is**

taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout..." – This indicates that the member(s) that removed and returned to the group is executed the new version while the member(s) that not yet removed and returned to the group is still executed the first version of the application).

As per claim 36, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the private symbolic link is private to a member (see at least col. 23:18-19
"**...local_dir is a privately owned directory 344 in a user's file system**").

As per claim 37, the rejection of claim 32 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

the first member still executes the first version of the computer application concurrently with the second member executing the new version of the computer application (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "**... members are automatically removed (i.e. bringing down) from and returned (i.e. bringing up) to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout..."** – This indicates that the member(s) that removed and returned to the group is executed the new version while the member(s) that not yet removed and returned to the group is still executed the first version of the application).

As per claim 38, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, Burgoon teaches:

the private symbolic link is private to a member (see at least col. 23:18-19
"**...local_dir is a privately owned directory 344 in a user's file system**").

As per claim 39, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, Dervin teaches:

the first member still executes the first version of the computer application concurrently with the second member executing the new version of the computer application (see Dervin col. 9:2-17 "... **members are automatically removed** (i.e. bringing down) **from and returned** (i.e. bringing up) **to a group whenever a node is taken down and brought back into the cluster, yet the group remains in an active state throughout...**" – This indicates that the member(s) that removed and returned to the group is executed the new version while the member(s) that not yet removed and returned to the group is still executed the first version of the application).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,130,897 to Dervin et al. ("Dervin"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,706,510 to Burgoon, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,08 to Earl et al. ("Earl").

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, Dervin does not explicitly teach
copying the shared file; and
patching the shared file to create the second version.

However, Earl teaches:

copying the shared file (see at least col. 6:15-16 "**copying the software from the first machine on which it is installed to the others**") and

patching the shared file to create the second version (see at least col. 6:19-20
“**new software releases, which may include software patches...**”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dervin to incorporate the teaching of Earl to copy the shared file and patching the shared file to create a second version. The modification would have been obvious because it would allow the user to store a copy for backup in case the updating fails.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phillip H. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 270-1070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 10:00 AM - 3:00 PM EST.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y. Zhen can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PN
11/19/2009
/Wei Y Zhen/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191